

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUZETTE TIPPITT,
Plaintiff,

v.

TESORO REFINING & MARKETING
COMPANY LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-03893-RS](#)


**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

The parties in this case have filed an administrative motion to file certain documents under seal in connection with their summary judgment briefing. As the designating party of the putatively confidential information, Tesoro bears the burden of pointing to compelling reasons justifying sealing and narrowly tailoring its request to target only sealable information. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); Civil Local Rule 79-5(b). Its submission does not satisfy the second of these requirements. While the need to protect the privacy of a defendant's non-party employee may justify sealing, Tesoro's request does not merely seek to redact sensitive information pertaining to the individual at issue here. Instead, Tesoro proposes to excise roughly half of the exhibits submitted in support of plaintiff's opposition from the public record. This overbroad request is denied.

Because certain information targeted by Tesoro's request is sealable, the administrative motion is denied without prejudice. Tesoro is directed to file a renewed sealing request, minimizing proposed redactions, no later than **one week** from the date of this order. The renewed request shall include a redacted version of each of the documents at issue. This order does not address the merits of Tesoro's motion for summary judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 20, 2015

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard Seeborg", written over a horizontal line.

RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California